



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Current Opinion.

Luke's Use of Mark's Gospel.

Sir John Hawkins, author of the valuable contribution to the synoptic problem entitled *Horae Synopticae*, discusses in the *Expository Times* for December the interrelation of the two accounts of the passion in the second and third gospels. He holds that the principle is established that the gospel of Mark is earlier than the gospels of Matthew and Luke, that it was taken up bodily into these two later books, and served as the framework of each. There are, however, certain exceptions and qualifications of this hypothesis which must be made. For instance, Luke has two long sections (6:20—8:3 and 9:51—18:14) which do not appear in Mark, and he omits from his gospel one whole Markan section (6:45—8:26); while Matthew, in chaps. 8—13, almost ignores the order of the parallel Markan narrative. Further, in Luke's passion narrative (22:14—24:10) there are noticeable departures from the Markan narrative, although the latter surely serves as the basis of the former: (1) In this section Matthew's gospel adheres nearly twice as closely as Luke's to the language of Mark. (2) The new matter (non-Markan) which Luke adds to his account of the passion, while not much more in amount than the new matter which Matthew adds to his passion account, is brought into connection with the Markan material in a strikingly free way. (3) Luke's account of the passion presents twelve transpositions or inversions, verbal and substantial, of Mark's order; few of these are of any practical importance in the way of giving us different impressions as to the course of events.

The conclusion reached is that Matthew used a written gospel of Mark in preparing his gospel, while Luke used an oral form of the same work.

The Letter-Writing of the Apostolic Age.

Communication by letter, says Professor Ramsay (in the *Expositor* for December) was one of the chief means of promoting Christianity, second only to visitation in person or by messenger. The early Christians saw the possibilities of correspondence, and therefore developed the letter into new forms, applied it to new uses, and placed it on a much higher plane. It became an effective agency for consolidating

and maintaining the sense of unity among the scattered members of the one universal church. In this way the congregations expressed their mutual affection and sympathy and sense of brotherhood, asked counsel of one another, gave advice with loving freedom and plain speaking to one another, imparted mutual comfort and encouragement, and generally expressed their sense of their common life.

This gave rise to a new kind of epistolary literature—the general letter addressed to a whole congregation or to the entire church of Christ. It was the apostle Paul, above all others, who created this new type of correspondence. These letters are true letters, in the sense that they spring from the heart of the writer and speak direct to the heart of the readers; that they rise out of the actual situation in which the writer conceives the readers to be placed; that they express the writer's keen and living sympathy with and participation in the fortunes of the whole class of persons addressed; that they are not affected by any thought of publication for a wider public than the persons immediately addressed. On the other hand, the letters of this class express general principles of life and conduct, religion and ethics, applicable to a wider range of circumstances than those which have called forth the special letter; and the letters appeal as emphatically and intimately to all Christians and in all time as they did to those addressed in the first instance. As expressing general truths and universal principles, those letters must have been the result of long and careful thought, though the final expression was often hasty and called forth by some special occasion.

What the Bible Can Do for Us.

In a pamphlet entitled *Christianity with a Book*, Rev. Philip S. Moxom, D.D., of Springfield, Mass., describes six ways in which the Bible can be of supreme service to men: (1) The Bible makes vivid and powerful the sense of God—his creative power, his unflinching providence, his perfect righteousness, his abundant mercy toward mankind, and his unfaltering purpose of good to all his creatures. (2) The Bible awakens the sense of sin by its unmistakable revelation of the divine law and by its insight into the heart and life of men; most of all does it bring into clear light the defects and the guilt of mankind by its exhibition of the perfect life of Jesus. (3) The Bible discloses the purpose and method of salvation; the prophets and psalmists grasped the fact of divine forgiveness and deliverance and inspiration but imperfectly, yet their vision anticipated the revelation which

shines forth with noonday clearness in the teaching and personality of Jesus. (4) The Bible awakens and strengthens the hope of immortality; the belief in immortality antedates the Bible, but the message and the resurrection of Jesus purified the hope and exalted it into an assured and joyous faith. (5) The Bible quickens intelligence, provokes thought, and pushes man on in the course of his proper development; no single influence in the world has wrought so strongly for mental awakening and progress as the Christian Scriptures; this book, with its divine message, has been the greatest educational force ever known. (6) The Bible civilizes life by setting before the mind a lofty standard of morals and making sensitive the conscience; by socializing men through its inculcation of good-will and obedience to law; by quickening their sense of obligation to promote the general weal, inciting to industry and thrift, and making life clean, wise, and humane. There is one Sovereign, one Father, one family; it recognizes no differences of race; as men are drawn to its standard of life, they are drawn to one another, and all appear as citizens of one kingdom of God.

Public Schools and Religious Education.

President Arthur T. Hadley, LL.D., of Yale University, in a recent address upon "Education and Religion," expresses clearly some of the most important ideas connected with this subject. After setting forth the views of the secularist on the one side, and of the advocate of church schools on the other, he shows that the antagonism of both parties is to be overcome by a higher view which unifies the secular school and the church school. He says: I do not believe that improvement is to be sought by substituting religious instruction for secular instruction, or by superadding one to the other as though the two were separate. I do not believe that you can prepare a man for citizenship by teaching a godless knowledge in one part of the school time and a set of religious principles in another part—any more than you can prepare a man for heaven by letting him cheat six days of the week and having him listen to the most orthodox doctrines on the seventh. I believe that both in school life and in after-life the moral training and the secular training must be so interwoven that each becomes a part of the other. If we can really get into our minds the fact that in any system of education, classical, scientific, or manual, accuracy and idealism are far more important than mere knowledge, we shall do away with the force of the objection that our teaching has no effect in char-

acter-building. For the formation of habits of accuracy and the development of ideals are themselves the very essence of character-building. If you can teach in this manner and in this spirit, the antithesis between education and religion disappears. Spelling and arithmetic, poetry and history, games and friendship, become lessons in conduct and helps to the formation of character.

Under such a conception, sound religious teaching is the outgrowth of good secular teaching. The use of the Bible in the schools justifies itself because it does, in fact, give those lessons in conduct and character which we regard as fundamentally important. Wherever we have tried to make Bible reading a thing apart from the rest of the school work, which we used because we thought that the Bible was verbally inspired, we found difficulty in defending our course against those taxpayers who denied that the Bible had any such special authority, and against those others who believed that there was a church authority at least co-ordinate with the Bible. But when we make our religious and moral aim as broad as our whole field of instruction, and use the Bible as we use any other book of poetry or history, then can we justify our principles in the face of all the world and look forward with confidence to the results which will follow the application of those principles.

To sum the whole matter up: The supposed antithesis between secular training and religious training arises from a misconception of what is involved in good training of any kind. People see the difference between bad secular education and bad religious education, and they assume that there must be a corresponding difference between good secular education and good religious education. This is by no means the case. When a master of a public school is occupied only with teaching facts and principles, and when a master of a religious institution is occupied only with teaching dogmas and observances, they necessarily work at cross-purposes; but the mere learning of facts and principles is not the vitally important part of secular education, nor is the learning of doctrines and observances the vitally important part of religious education. The formation of habits of discipline and the development of ideals of unselfishness is the essentially important thing in a good education of either kind. When we have grasped this truth, we shall see that there is in the field of education the same harmony between the true needs of the world and the true needs of the church which exists in every other department of human life.